

**REMARKS**

The Applicants respectfully request for further examination and consideration in view of the amendments above and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-45 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15-23, 25-34, 36-40, 42 and 45 have been rejected, Claim 44 has been allowed and Claims 6, 14, 24, 35, 41 and 43 have been objected to. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 8, 19, 29, 40 and 42 have been amended and Claims 6, 14, 24, 35, 41, 43 and 45 have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15-23, 25-34, 36-40, 42 and 44 are currently pending.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,355 to Palmer et al. (“Palmer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,302 to Einbinder (“Einbinder”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,483,846 to Huang et al. (“Huang”).

Within the Office Action, Claims 8, 10-13 and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,747,979 to Banks et al. (“Banks”) in view of Palmer, Huang and U.S. Patent No. 7,275,255 to Suda et al. (“Suda”).

Within the Office Action, Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks in view of Palmer, Huang and Suda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,267 to Thaler et al. (“Thaler”).

Within the Office Action, Claims 19-23, 25, 29-34 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Banks, Huang and Einbinder.

Within the Office Action, Claims 26, 27, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Banks, Huang in view of Einbinder and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,529 to Krishnakumar et al. (“Krishnakumar”).

Within the Office Action, Claims 28 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Banks, Huang and Einbinder and further in view of Thaler.

Within the Office Action, Claims 40 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,453 to Romans et al. (“Romans”) in view of Huang.

Within the Office Action, Claim 42 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,450,411 to Heil (“Heil”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019731 to Brown (“Brown”) and Huang.

Within the Office Action, Claims 6, 14, 24, 35, 41 and 43 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the above amendment, the independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations from the objected to Claim 6 and the objected to Claim 6 has been canceled. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 3-5 and 7 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 3-5 and 7 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

By the above amendment, the independent Claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations from the objected to Claim 14 and the objected to Claim 14 has been canceled. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 10-13 and 15-18 are dependent on the independent Claim 8. As described above, the independent Claim 8 is allowable. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 10-13 and 15-18 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

By the above amendment, the independent Claim 19 has been amended to include the limitations from the objected to Claim 24 and the objected to Claim 24 has been canceled. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20-23 and 25-28 are dependent on the independent Claim 19. As described above, the independent Claim 19 is allowable. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 20-23 and 25-28 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

By the above amendment, the independent Claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations from the objected to Claim 35 and the objected to Claim 35 has been canceled. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 29 is allowable.

Claims 30-34 and 36-39 are dependent on the independent Claim 29. As described above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 30-34 and 36-39 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

By the above amendment, the independent Claim 40 has been amended to include the limitations from the objected to Claim 41 and the objected to Claim 41 has been canceled. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 40 is allowable.

By the above amendment, the independent Claim 42 has been amended to include the limitations from the objected to Claim 43 and the objected to Claim 43 has been canceled. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 42 is allowable.

Within the Office Action, it is indicated that the independent Claim 44 is allowable.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be greatly appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: March 20, 2009

By: /Jonathan O. Owens/  
Jonathan O. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,902  
Attorneys for Applicants